UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/575,412	04/10/2006	Philip Steven Newton	FR 030123	3707
	7590 08/20/200 LLECTUAL PROPER	EXAMINER		
P.O. BOX 3001		GIARDINO JR, MARK A		
BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
		2185		
		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			08/20/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/575,412	NEWTON ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	

	Wir di Cir Cir Cir Cir Cir Cir Cir Cir Cir Ci	2100
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap	pears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence address
THE REPLY FILED <u>21 July 2008</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS AP	PLICATION IN CONDITION FOR A	LLOWANCE.
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or application, applicant must timely file one of the followin application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Apfor Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 periods:	g replies: (1) an amendment, affidav peal (with appeal fee) in compliance	it, or other evidence, which places the with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mail	ing date of the final rejection.	
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or	e later than SIX MONTHS from the mailin or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THI	g date of the final rejection.
MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.0 Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The da have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office lat may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(NOTICE OF APPEAL	te on which the petition under 37 CFR 1. extension and the corresponding amount e shortened statutory period for reply orig ter than three months after the mailing da	of the fee. The appropriate extension fee inally set in the final Office action; or (2) as
2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in cor	npliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be	filed within two months of the date of
filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any ex Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed AMENDMENTS	tension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection (a) They raise new issues that would require further of (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE be	consideration and/or search (see NO	
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in be appeal; and/or (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling	etter form for appeal by materially re	
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a		ected ciairris.
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1	• •	ompliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(,
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be non-allowable claim(s).	·	-
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a how the new or amended claims would be rejected is proposed amendment (s): a how the new or amended claims would be rejected is proposed amendment (s): a follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		Il be entered and an explanation of
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE		
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, l because applicant failed to provide a showing of good a was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 		
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filir entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar 	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appe	al and/or appellant fails to provide a
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanat REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	ion of the status of the claims after e	ntry is below or attached.
The request for reconsideration has been considered I See Continuation Sheet.	but does NOT place the application in	n condition for allowance because:
12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s)13. ☐ Other:). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)	
/Sanjiv Shah/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2185		

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: With respect to applicant's argument regarding Claims 1, 15, and 20 that Sprigg does not teach "a storage management unit for allocating a portion of the local storage arrangement to the removable storage carrier and referencing the portion with identification information respecting respective access rights to a data item stored in the portion granted to the software application stored on the removable data carrier" has been considered but is not persuasive.

It is unclear what is meant in the argument on Page 9 when applicant argues Sprigg allocates a portion of a common storage area to an application and data related to the application and how this applies to the claims. While Sprigg teaches that the applications and data are all stored on a common storage device 110 (the portion of the local storage arrangement allocated to the removable storage carrier), and that Sprigg teaches that these applications are protected (Paragraph 0055 and abstract of Sprigg) thus respecting respective access rights to a data item stored in the portion granted to the software application stored on the removable data carrier, and further that the portions have identification information (Paragraph 0034 in Sprigg) it does not appear that not allocating a portion of a common storage area to an application and data related to the application is in the language of the claim.

With regard to the arguments on claims 4-6, 8-10, and 16-19. applicant's arguments fail to comply with 37 CFR 1.111(b) because they amount to a general allegation that the claims define a patentable invention without specifically pointing out how the language of the claims patentably distinguishes them from the references.